DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 864 IR 050 161

AUTHOR Wright, H. Curtis
TITLE An Interdisciplinary Philosophy of Librarianship.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Society of Educators and Scholars (Union, NJ, September 29-October 2, 1982).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Epistemology; Ethics; *Library Science; *Philosophy
IDENTIFIERS Metaphysics; Pragmatism

ABSTRACT

The excessive pragmatism of American librarians has thus far prevented them from formulating a defensible philosophy of librarianship because their knowledge problems cannot be resolved by action theory. Analysis of the metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics of librarianship shows that its realities consist of the invisible structure of thought, that ideative realities of this sort are immune to empirical study because they cannot be observed, and that human action in relation to such realities is, and must always remain, strictly instrumental. The American system of librarianship is therefore short-circuited at its source, which explains why the physical methods of scientific action theory are thoroughly inappropriate for studying the formal realities of librarianship. (Author/ESR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED227864

An Interdisciplinary Philosophy of Librarianship

by

H. Curtis Wright

IR050161

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. Curtis Wright
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

An Interdisciplinary Philosophy of Librarianship

By H. Curtis Wright

How do you create a philosophy of librarianship? There are many ways, of course; but an extremely useful approach comes from anthropology, which "has found a formula for creating the critical philosophy of a discipline by spelling out its metaphysics, its epistemology, and its ethics."[1] Here is a way for librarians to construct their own philosophy of librarianship, if they will, because metaphysics, epistemology and ethics constitute the irreducibles of philosophical analysis--the necessary ingredients in any recipe for cooking up a critical philosophy of anything. The librarians will have to apply the formula to themselves in order to do it. They should do it in order, too, by formulating their metaphysical beliefs about the realities they deal with before considering the derivative problems of thinking (epistemology) or acting (ethics) in relation to these realities. Those moderns who interpret Descartes' cogito ergo sum as the discrediting of metaphysics by epistemology[2] will not agree with this approach. But that Cartesian pronouncement, despite its modern interpretation, is wholly (and perhaps intentionally) ambiguous. Does Descartes mean that he exists because he thinks, as modern philosophy alleges? Or does he think because he exists? This paper accepts the latter point of view and rejects being as an inference from thought. Thinking, which always occurs in a mind and never in a vacuum, is firmly grounded in being. You have to be in order to think, in other words; for unless you exist in the first place, you can neither think nor do anything at all.

What, then, is the real nature of librarianship? This question has no scientific answer, for science cannot study natures.[3] We can ask such philosophical questions, however, about the irreducibles of librarianship. These include, as already stated, the questions of (1) metaphysics (our beliefs about the realities librarians must deal with), (2) epistemology (our theories explaining how those realities are known), and (3) ethics (our theories explaining how best to act in relation to those realities).[4] As the job of the library educator is to discover the system implicit in librarianship and explain it, whereas the librarian's job is to learn that system in order to implement it, we can begin by asking and attempting to answer some basic questions about these irreducibles.

Two Metaphysical Questions.--What are the ultimate realities of librarianship? Do they reduce to atomic complexes of some sort with electro-chemical properties

in the physical world of matter and energy? Or do they consist in matterless patterns derived from the noetic world of formal thought? Most librarians would agree, I suppose, that their ultimate realities are related to information. A word of caution is necessary, however: we can accept ideas (and reject data) as our ultimate realities or vice versa; but we cannot have it both ways, for ideas belong to the formal universe whereas data are experiential givens in the physical world.[5] This crucial difference between data and ideas must be clearly understood, because information is basic to librarianship only if it is composed of ideas. If composed of data, on the other hand, information has only a derived and instrumental relevance to librarianship. The implicit ambiguity of "information," which does yeoman service in both the world of form and the world of matter-energy, must therefore be resolved. Otherwise, we will be burned in the short circuit caused by two kinds of information derived from radically different orders of reality. This suggests the second metaphysical question.

What is information? Which world is its natural home? It took the Greek philosophers two or three centuries to discover that the worlds of form and matter, though interacting with each other, are distinct and separate, and that natural realities therefore exist only (1) <u>in nonphysical ways</u> (within the formal universe) or (2) <u>in physical ways</u> (within the material universe). We should accept these conclusions, which have since been verified by the entire history of philosophy,[6] because librarians don't have the luxury of taking hundreds of years to rediscover them. They mean, if accepted, that there are only two basic concepts of information: either it reduces to data (something physical in the phenomenal world of matter-energy), or it reduces to ideas (something nonphysical in the abstract pattern world of noetic forms). Since the technical concept of information-as-data is presupposed by virtually all information professionals today, we who oppose it will probably fail in our efforts to convince the information community that the received version of librarianship is inherently problematic because it is based on the wrong intellectual tradition. Librarians are not scientists descended from the matter-philosophers through Democritus, Bacon, and Einstein. We must grapple with the knowledge aspect of human life, not indirectly and instrumentally as scientists concerned with real existents, but directly and fundamentally as humanists devoted to the ideas of form-philosophy because we are concerned with human subjective <u>reports</u> about existents--or about anything else. Our only legitimate concern, therefore, is human subjectivity; and for that, the communication of information-as-ideas is absolutely indispensable. We live, however, in an electronic age when the ancient

linguistic concept of information-as-ideas has been sacrificed to the modern mathematical concept of information-as-data by the scientific religion of matter and energy. Librarianship, to be sure, is intimately involved with the communication of human knowledge. There are nevertheless two kinds of knowledge to communicate: (1) factual knowledge about data derived from the physical universe external to man, and (2) formal knowledge about ideas derived from the metaphysical universe within man. Mathematics, the noetic technology of scientific matter-philosophy, is a descriptive language for communicating man's intellectual knowledge of realities, which includes most of what he knows about physical objects, processes, forces, and force fields.[7] Librarians, on the other hand, cannot communicate man's knowledge of intellectual realities without the referential use of natural language, which constitutes the noetic technology of humanistic form-philosophy. Mathematical thinking is thus "an instrument for application to physical problems;" its use is therefore restricted to the factual order of space-time/matter-energy because it can only describe what is.[8] The artificial language of mathematics, in other words, cannot describe anything outside of the material universe; but the natural languages, despite their descriptive weaknesses, can refer to anything in either universe, whether it exists in the world man lives in or in the world that lives in man. The librarians, however, have never understood the difference between physical and metaphysical knowledge; and library education has opted--unofficially, of course--for the mathematical communication of the former by swapping the foreign language requirement for the statistics option in its curriculum.[9] This exorcising (by virtually unanimous incantation) of language studies from the quantic mentality of the library educators has encouraged "the enthusiastic manipulation of new statistical tools" by librarians, and has quite literally littered the literature of librarianship with the "meaningless use of mathematical symobls ... and homespun 'applications' of information theory and other scientific subject matter--all intellectually embarrassing and professionally unimportant."[10] The magnificent mumbo jumbo of mathematics, meanwhile, has never helped a librarian orient a patron to the landscape of ideas. It does not become librarians, therefore, to humble themselves before the neopagan gods of mathematics and science; it is rather their sacred duty to reject the physical concept of information-as-data, which reduces librarianship to notation science, and re-assert the metaphysical concept of information-as-ideas, which regards it as the cartography of knowledge.

An Epistemological Question.--What are the best ways of thinking about the realities of librarianship? Again, there are two basic alternatives, which

correspond to the two views of what those realities are.

If our ultimate realities reduce to data, the best ways of thinking about them are empirical. A strong commitment to experiential learning by observation and experiment must then follow, because (as implied by words like emPIRical, erPERiment, and exPERience) empiricism means that the human mind insists on getting its food for thought through the PORes of the human sensory body. It also follows that the methodology of librarianship and library education will be controlled by the numerate data mongers, mathematical wizards, and statistical button counters of physical science. That, as a matter of fact, is precisely what has happened. The librarians and information scientists, by accepting materialistic ways of thinking about their formal realities, have reified information (by reducing ideas to data) in order to study it scientifically. This is a classic instance of the hypostatic fallacy: we have transferred ideas, which belong to the noetic world of non-physical order/structure/form, to the world of physical realities by endowing them with a content and substance (hypostasis) they do not possess--all because science cannot function without objectified concepts.[11] That is why our information professionals have reduced the study of information to data science, and why, incidentally, we have swallowed the whole scientific package, which includes telecommunications engineering (chasing electrical disturbances through electronic mazes), general systems theory (a formalized way of thinking for application to empirical studies), cybernetics (controlling physical systems by means of physical feedback), and all the rest. We are out of our skulls if we elect to follow this analytical mode of thinking any further into its blind alley, because we all know that librarianship is idea science, not data science.

If our ultimate realities reduce to ideas, then the best ways of thinking about them are rational, not empirical. This implies commitment to the recognitive methods of critical humanisim, which are essentially introspective and perceptive as in the arts, not observational and reflective as in science. The study of ideas by humanistic methods, in which facts/data/phenomena are utilized as communicative instruments, has not been (and probably cannot be) systematized like the methods of science, in which facts/data/phenomena are analyzed as objects of study. These two functions of data--as objects of study or as instruments of communication--should never be confused. Librarians should plainly pursue the latter, because scientific information about data is wholly instrumental to human communications--as are the data themselves.[12]

Ethical Questions Derived from Action Theory.--What is the librarian's job? What is the function we must perform in the best of all possible ways in order to qualify as librarians? It is simply orientation to information, provided that information is conceived as ideas, not as data. Librarianship is intellectual cartography, the human art of orienting people to ideas--"a service that constitutes its entire product, the only legitimate contribution it can make to anyone under any circumstances."[13] Everything the librarian does specifically qua librarian is instrumental to the performance of that function. But another word of caution is necessary, lest the professional function of librarians be confused with their administrative function: the professional function is to orient patrons to whatever knowledge is available for study, whereas the administrative function is to manage the resources of specific library operations as a means of performing the professional function.

What, then, is the best way of performing the librarian's professional function? No one knows the proper technique for maximizing a patron's orientation to knowledge. But creating that technique is clearly an intellectual problem in which action is subservient to knowledge. It is not the other way around, as the American librarians and library educators would have it, for this is not a practical problem that can be resolved by the anti-intellectual "solutions" of their inordinate library pragmatism.[14] Indeed, it is the overly practical outlook of American librarianship in all things[15] that is largely responsible for its vigorous anti-intellectualism.[16] "Pragmatism originated in the United States...at the hands of the American philosophers Peirce, James, Dewey, and Mead,"[17] all of whom exalted action over thought. Anti-intellectualism, furthermore, "is virtually equivalent to Jamesian pragmatism"[18]--as acknowledged by William James himself, who placed it squarely in the mainstream of philosophical materialism:

> It agrees with [materialistic] nominalism...in always appealing to particulars; with [materialistic] utilitarianism in emphasizing practical aspects; with [materialistic] positivism in its disdain for verbal solutions, useless questions, and metaphysical abstractions.
>
> All these [variants of materialism], you see, are anti-intellectualist tendencies. Against rationalism as a pretension and a method, pragmatism is fully armed and militant.... It has no dogmas, and no doctrines save its [materialistic] method.[19]

Despite its widespread acceptance among information professionals, therefore, pragmatism is an indefensible philosophical stance in the librarian for two reasons: (1) it constitutes an experientially biased philosophy of action derived from

scientific materialism;[20] and (2) the knowledge problems of a humanistic idea business like librarianship cannot be resolved by action theory because theories of knowledge (epistemology) are not reducible to theories of action (ethics/societology/science). "The conventional techniques ... used by librarians," moreover," are based on quite unsophisticated assumptions.... Their discipline is a vast accumulation of technical details rather than a body of organized abstract principles that can be applied in concrete situations."[21] In the end, however, after all of our muttering and whimpering and rationalizing, we must come up with a best way of orienting patrons to ideas or forfeit all hope of achieving professional status. This means negotiating the tricky intellectual interface between (1) the intellectual structure of knowledge, and (2) the librarian's technology of intellectual access to the intellectual structure of knowledge; and that is an intellectual problem to end all intellectual problems.[22]

If this point of view were ever taken seriously by librarians and library educators, it would drastically overhaul the current perception of librarianship. "These are tides running, and currents moving beneath the surface," says Shera, "that can dramatically reshape the coastline of librarianship so familiar to us today." The librarian can ignore these influences "and follow the sabre-toothed tiger to extinction; or he can see in them the vision of a new heaven and a new earth with ... almost unlimited enrichment of the intellectual content of his professional practice."[23] Of the many changes implied by all this, I shall mention only the involvement of librarianship with interdisciplinarity and with research. I am irretrievably committed to Shera's vision of a neolibrarianship. I see it as a comprehensive synthesis of knowledge in which ideas about anything that is known can be located and correlated with ideas about everything else that is known. I also see it, not as a subculture of information science, but as the larger discipline which includes information science among its ancillary subcultures. Information science can help librarianship with its communicative tooling; but that's all it can do--unless it abandons the physical methods of science as a means of solving formal problems. Science cannot explain intersubjective communication because there are no objective explanations of subjectivity: human communication can never occur, that is, until the output of some information-as-data system has been interpreted subjectively in terms of information-as-ideas by the self-conscious mind. Not by the nonconscious brain, mind you, but by the self-conscious mind.[24] This has definite implications for library education. Shera saw them, too, for he

offered an interdisciplinary alternative to the study of information science at Case Western Reserve. He therefore expected the students who elected that alternative to "marry" the PH.D.-granting discipline of their choice, to master the subject matter of that discipline, and to discuss that subject matter with their peers (who were working in academic departments all over the university) in weekly seminars on library education. Shera was moving in all this toward building an exhaustive synthesis of knowledge about the intellectual structure of every imaginable discipline in order to familiarize librarians with the objects and methods of study in all of the human subject matters. He was trying to put the shattered Humpty Dumpty of knowledge together again, to rebuild its fragmented analytika into an interdisciplinary unity for librarians to study as a whole in relation to its parts. He didn't exactly succeed in this, but he was at least pointing in the right direction. And that prompts the following remarks about the rigorous interdisciplinarity of librarianship.

All professions are interdisciplinary to some degree, because they all draw freely on their supportive disciplines in the academic colleges: medicine, for example, is nourished by physics, chemistry, anatomy, biology, zoology, and so forth.[25] But librarianship is totally interdisciplinary. It is not a subject matter: it is a way of relating to subject matter. It has a direct relationship to every discipline there is, which means that the supportive disciplines of librarianship include everything in the liberal arts curriculum as a bare minimum, and much else besides.[26] The reluctance of library educators to face the truly overwhelming implications of this comprehensive interdisciplinarity is understandable; but overwhleming or not, those implications must eventually be faced. Library educators should therefore oppose the continuing rejection of difficult intellectual problems by the action theorists, who perpetuate the supernarrow views of librarianship and research which have plagued library education from its inception. Their "manageable realism" shows up in many ways, including (1) its deification of descriptive studies (which are always dignified as "research"); and (2) its addiction to the researcher's view of critical inquiry (and the virtually total exclusion of other viewpoints, such as the observer's view of research). As to the former, the factual account of what is always leads empirical researchers to consider the physical aspects of library operations: they are thus derailed onto the behavioral function of the librarian (and of the physical system he manages qua administrator); they cannot investigate the librarian's professional function as the manager of ideas; their studies have both a pronounced recency-bias and a limited

shelf-life (sometimes only a few weeks before going out of date); they cannot make normative judgments (because good realists do not discuss what ought to be); and they cannot produce those larger kinds of scholarly studies which will still interest librarians centuries from now. And as to the latter, the library schools apparently think they are training researchers who become librarians in order to pursue their own research interests. There is nothing wrong, of course, with librarians who know how to function as researchers; but our major involvement with research is maieutic; we are intellectual midwives whose job is to assist patrons in giving birth to their researches. In order to do that, however, we must concentrate on the formal structure and noetic strategies of research. But the library schools, by failing to see that the librarian's patrons are all researchers (varying from superelementary to ultrasophisticated), have emphasized the functional substance, content, results, and conclusions of research. This fundamental error should be corrected forthwith, because librarians are not researchers: they are the philosophical observers of research who must function as research counselors to their patrons.

The research potential of librarianship, finally, is truly enormous. It includes applied research into the immediate problems of library practice; but it also includes basic research into (1) librarianship as a field of study, (2) any of its supportive disciplines, (3) the entire geography of knowledge, (4) the role of the sensible symbol as the means of intersubjective communication, and (5) the nature of human critical inquiry into anything. The library educators should therefore invent "logology." We should create, in other words, a critical Studienswissenschaft, a kind of "researchology," if you will, a philosophy of research that takes the human study and communication of anything as its proper objects of concern.[27] If this research potential could ever be released, it would free the educators of librarianship from their bondage to its practitioners. In the prestigious professions, educational policy is determined by basic research, not by practice--and certainly not by "practical" research into the mechanics of practice.[28] The function of professional education is to reduce the results of basic research to teachable procedures for the skillful application of knowledge. Educators cannot do that, however, if they are always running to the practitioners to see what should be going on in their classrooms. The application of knowledge always presupposes the existence of knowledge to be applied, because you can't apply nothing. But practitioners seldom create the knowledge they apply: they get it from the educators, who got it from the researchers who created it. In medicine, for example, most of the basic research is done by the Ph.D.s--by

scientists, that is to say, who are nondoctors in the medical schools or in the supportive disciplines. Their research, meanwhile, is continuously evaluated for its medical significance by the educators; and the M.D.s must check constantly with their educators to see what should be going on in their practices. That's the way it is in professions like medicine, architecture, and engineering. It's not that way, though, in librarianship: it's the other way around, because library education, to say nothing of librarianship itself, has never been oriented to basic research. The skillful application of knowledge by librarians is therefore next to impossible, as knowledge must exist (because it has already been created by basic research) before it can be applied to anything. Ad hoc applications abound, of course, but they seldom qualify as research. The educators and practitioners of librarianship have always done their housework, and done it well; but they cannot get the what, the why, and the how of their act together because they have never done their homework.[29]

NOTES TO: An Interdisciplinary Philosophy of Librarianship

[1]I have mentioned this formula in "An Anthropological Model for Librarianship," Scholar and Educator, Spring, 1981, 31. The entire article should be consulted.

[2]"The history of epistemology is ... the progressive discrediting of metaphysics," W. E. Carlo, Philosophy, Science and Knowledge (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1967), 75. Cf. ibid., 86: "Epistemology ... is the judge of metaphysics.... This conception of epistemology ... began with René Descartes."

[3]"A science such as physics ... has no business ... analyzing the nature of anything because natures do not fall within its proper sphere," ibid., 28.

[4]Action theory actually includes more than ethics, which concerns the proper conduct of individuals, and especially of individual workers. But societology (also known as social science, or the study of human interaction) and physical science (the study of matter in motion) are also subsumed by action theory. Ethics, which is the normative study of individual conduct, should also be distinguished from morality, which studies the actual behavior of individuals.

[5]On the difference between physical existents and nonphysical subsistents see R. F. Piper and P. W. Ward, The Fields and Methods of Knowledge ... (New York: F. S. Crofts, 1933), 178-79. The difference between data and ideas is the most basic instance of this fundamental difference.

[6]See W. K. C. Guthrie, "Greek Ways of Thinking," in his The Greek Philosophers from Thales to Aristotle (New York: Harper & Row, 1960), 1-21. "This division of philosophers into ... matter-philosophers and form-philosophers ... is perhaps the most fundamental that can be made in any age, our own included," ibid., 21.

[7]On the necessity of adding electro-magnetic and nuclear forces and force fields to the physical objects and processes of the mechanistic model of matter, see Karl R. Popper and John C. Eccles, The Self and Its Brain (New York: Springer International, 1977), 8, 10, 542, and elsewhere.

[8]Alfred North Whitehead, Science and the Modern World ("Lowell Lectures," 1925; New York: Macmillan, 1962), 81. See also my discussion of this and similar statements by Whitehead in "Science and the Institutional Professions," Scholar and Educator, Spring, 1982, 11-13. Pure mathematics, of course, whose symbols are not defined in terms of anything real, can discuss physical possibilities; but mathematical description is nevertheless limited to physical actualities.

[9]"When a standard procedure is abandoned--comprehensive examinations, for example, or the foreign language requirement--the justification is that it is no longer relevant to current professional needs," Lester Asheim, "New Trends in the Curriculum of Library Schools," in H. Goldhor, ed., Education for Librarianship: the Design of the Curriculum of Library Schools (Urbana, Ill.: Univ. of Illinois, Grad. School of Library Science, 1971), 76. The library educators were merely following the lead of the American graduate schools, in which "the traditional two-language, university-wide, requirement has come under criticism and has largely disappeared," Richard L. Admussen, "Trends in the Ph.D. Language Requirement," Modern Language Journal, 51 (1967), 347. This entire article should be consulted.

See also pertinent remarks on language study and librarianship by A. D. Osborn, "The Design of the Curriculum for the Third Era of Education for Librarianship," in Goldhor, ed., Education for Librarianship, 186; D. B. Walch, "Library Education and Foreign Language Requirements," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 11 (1970-71), 166-81; and J. D. Anderson, "Foreign Language Barriers in Information Transfer," JEL, 14 (1973-74), 171-84.

[10]Conrad H. Rawski, "The Interdisciplinarity of Librarianship," in Conrad H. Rawski, ed., Toward a Theory of Librarianship; Papers in Honor of Jesse Hank Shera (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973), 137. Cf. similar remarks by D. J. Foskett, ibid., 170.

[11]On the hypostatic fallacy of abstraction, see Piper and Ward, The Fields and Methods of Knowledge, 158, 176, 213, 253; and Guthrie, The Greek Philosophers, 91-94, where natural laws and diseases are discussed as examples.

[12]I have discussed these matters briefly in "The Informational Function of the Physical Datum in Human Communications," Scholar and Educator, Spring, 1979, 27-34, and at greater length in "The Instrumentality of Data," NLA Newsletter, 6 (May, 1981), 3-9.

[13]From my "The Wrong Way to Go," Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 30 (March, 1979), 74.

[14]Cf. remarks about the excessive pragmatism of the Anglo-American librarians and their educators by D. J. Foskett and J. H. Shera in Conrad H. Rawski, ed., Toward a Theory of Librarianship ... (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973), 169, 471-72.

[15]The all-inclusive nature of pragmatism was asserted by William James, Pragmatism: a New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking ... (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978), 30, who argued that the older pragmatists "were preluders only. Not until in our own time has it generalized itself, become conscious of a universal mission, pretended to a conquering destiny. I believe in that destiny, and I hope I may end by inspiring you with my belief."

[16]Cf. D. Isaacson, "Anti-intellectualism in American Libraries," Library Journal, 107 (1 Feb. 1982), 227-32; and L. Dee Garrison, "The Tender Technicians," Journal of Academic Librarianship, 3 (1977), 10-19.

[17]J. H. Randall and J. Buchler, Philosophy; an Introduction (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1971), 126.

[18]G. Wright and A. Mejia, eds., An Age of Controversy ... (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1970), 10, citing H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society (New York: Knopf, 1958), 36, who adds that anti-intellectualism "suggests the revulsion from ideology and the a priori, from the abstract thought of the century and a half preceding [the 1890s], which served to unite writers ... so far apart as Durkheim and Sorel. It recalls the influence and prestige of William James.... It offers a satisfactory common denominator for grouping a large proportion of the intellectual innovations of the 1890s." See ibid., 176-77 on Sorel's own Jamesian pragmatism and his dislike of the term "anti-intellectualism" for describing it.

[19]James, Pragmatism, 32. Italics his. Idealism "is far too intellectualistic" for pragmatism, which "turns her back upon the intellectualist point of view altogether," ibid, 39, 62. Cf. Randall and Buchler, Philosophy, 135: "In James pragmatism becomes a revolt against 'intellectualism' because he tacitly identified this with rationalism," and with its "predominant emphasis on the intellectual powers." Italics theirs.

[20]Ibid., 126: "Pragmatism is a form of empiricism, and ... it has something in common with the other form of empiricism..., positivism." See also ibid., 133.

[21]J. H. Shera, "Librarians Against Machines," in his Knowing Books and Men ... (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1973), 262.

[22]"Yet the study of the nature of knowledge, and of the relationship between the structure of knowledge ... and the librarian's tools for intellectual access to that knowledge, have received almost no attention and certainly no intensive exploration," J. H. Shera, The Foundations of Education for Librarianship (New York: Becker and Hayes, 1972), 110-111.

[23]J. H. Shera, Documentation and the Organization of Knowledge (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1966), 121.

[24]This distinction between the self-conscious mind and the neural machinery of the brain constitutes the entire subject matter of Karl R. Popper and John C. Eccles, The Self and its Brain (Berlin: Springer International, 1977), and of much collateral material by both Popper and Eccles.

[25]Discussed in relation to medicine and architecture in the classic article on profession by Abraham Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession?" School and Society, 1 (1915), 903, and endlessly repeated in the subsequent literature.

[26]See Conrad H. Rawski, "The Interdisciplinarity of Librarianship," in Toward a Theory of Librarianship ... , ed. C. H. Rawski (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973), 116-46.

[27]I have discussed this research potential and related matters in "The Professionalization of American Librarianship," Utah Libraries, 18 (Spring, 1975), 24-33.

[28]Library educators should be wary of the kind of "research" advocated, for example, by P. D. Leedy, Practical Research: Planning and Design (2d ed.; New York: Macmillan, 1980), which virtually guarantees the exaltation of highly focussed studies as research by repudiating total-field awareness and rejecting philosophical questions as non-problems, thus removing them from consideration. This sort of "research" does not simply reject answers: it rejects the questions it dislikes and cannot handle.

[29]See Shera, Knowing Books and Men, 262-66.